



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and their governments scatter these official statements broadcast in order that they may lay hold of this public opinion and educate and enlighten it, so that the power of public opinion, above them and beyond them, but necessary to them, may declare itself in their favor. We are over-familiar with the manifesto of the sovereign to his subjects and with his appeal to posterity as a justification for a war, generally unjust. "Die Weltgeschichte" is indeed, as the Germans put it, "das Weltgericht," which may be paraphrased, but hardly translated, as "History is the ultimate court of appeal." But we are not dealing with the public opinion of any belligerent country, but with the public opinion of neutral countries. We are not dealing with the public opinion of the future, but with the public opinion of the present day. "The old order changeth, yielding place to new." As the recognition of the power of public opinion is, I veritably believe, a discovery of the New World, so is this appeal to contemporary opinion a recognition of the fact that distance is almost as sure a judge as time. You will find it all stated in a letter, of which I am very fond, written from Paris by the venerable Doctor Franklin to the illustrious Washington, then in command of the Revolutionary Army:

More you would know and enjoy what posterity will say of Washington. For a thousand leagues have nearly the same effect with a thousand years.

A little while ago, within the memory of many now living, a great English statesman, Mr. Robert Lowe, later Viscount Sherbrooks, bitterly opposed in Parliament the Second Reform Bill, which extended the suffrage to classes which had hitherto not enjoyed its blessings. After his defeat he made the remark, or at least the remark is attributed to him, that "we must now educate our masters." It is a simple phrase, a commonplace if you will, but upon its realization depends the future. To make it what we believe it should be, we must indeed "educate our masters," and our masters are the men and women of all countries who make or mar public opinion.

The thought which I would like to leave, and in concluding I beg to emphasize by restating it, is that the power of public opinion, which has crept so noiselessly into the world as to pass almost unnoticed, has nevertheless come to stay, and that it must be educated. It must not be merely a public opinion; it must be an enlightened public opinion; and the great problem of the present, the great hope of the future, is that men of education and that men of influence shall contribute as best they may to the development of this public opinion, in order that it shall be an enlightened public opinion, and that it may be crystallized into an international opinion, which will not only make and control institutions, but which will make and control the thoughts as well as the actions of men.

EXPLOSIVE PATRIOTISM

By LEWIS S. GANNETT

MR. HUDSON MAXIM is one of the foremost of those "patriots" who are for some reason or other gallivanting about this country urging an increase in our military and naval defenses.

"We need," says Mr. Maxim, "to upbuild our navy until it shall not be outclassed by any other navy on earth. With such a navy we should not need so large an army as we should require with a weaker navy, but we should yet require an army of moderate size. An army of 500,000 men would be one of moderate size for the United States. In addition, we should have a militia trained to arms; but if the Swiss system of military education in the common schools were introduced, we should, after a few years, lessen the need of so large a militia force" (*New York American*, July 25, 1915).

Further, "a nation's most important fortifications outside of its army and navy are shops where guns and munitions are made. . . . Victory or defeat in modern battle depends almost entirely upon preponderance of artillery fire, and this, in turn, depends upon the ability to turn out sufficient field guns and the munitions to feed them. . . . Each of the hard-won successes of the war has been a victory for high explosives" (*New York American*, July 25; *New York Times*, July 11, 1915).

All this is very interesting, and may be true. Then again it may not. In considering such questions, it is always well to know who our informant is. Is he in a position to give us unbiased, disinterested advice?

Who's Who for 1914-1915 says (and the account was presumably written by Mr. Maxim himself) that Mr. Maxim "took up business of ordnance and explosives 1888; was first to make smokeless powder in U. S. and first to submit samples to U. S. Government for trial; built at Maxim, N. J. (named for him), 1890, dynamite factory and smokeless powder mill; in 1897 sold smokeless powder inventions to E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Wilmington, Del., and is now consulting engineer and expert in development department of that company. U. S. Government adopted his smokeless powder; in 1901 sold to U. S. Government formula of 'Maximite,' first high explosive to be fired through heavy armor plate; has perfected 'stabilite,' 'motorite,' 'multi-perforated powder grains,' etc., etc. His brother, who invented the Maxim gun, is a director of Vickers' Sons & Maxim, the great English makers of munitions; his nephew, inventor of the Maxim Silencer, is president of the Maxim Silent Firearms Co. and a partner of Maxim & Goodbridge.

Mr. Maxim assured the Conference on International Relations, held at Ithaca, N. Y., in June, that he was not in any way interested in the manufacture or sale of munitions, and that his "patriotic" activity was entirely disinterested. How Mr. Maxim harmonizes this with the position of consulting engineer in the Du Pont Powder Co. is a little difficult to understand. It may be that he has resigned. But in the *New York Times* for July 11 he says: "During the past week I have received

a cable from an old friend in England who has been selling war munitions to the allies. He asked me how quickly I could get a million rifles made in the United States. The best bids I have been able to obtain," etc. It is really rather hard to understand—this disinterestedness of Mr. Maxim. Is it to be supposed that he has no longer any interest in this nasty business to which he has given his life?

Are we to assume, then, that Mr. Maxim urges greater armament deliberately and consciously in order to put more money into his own pocket? No, hardly that; but a man is almost inevitably biased in favor of that which lines his purse. The woolen manufacturers were sincere in their belief that the removal of their protective tariff would ruin the country; but it didn't. They saw things crooked, and it was their interest in the business that made them see crooked. Mr. Maxim and the other manufacturers of armaments are in the same position. They may be honest and sincere in their advocacy of greater stocks of ammunition and more battleships, but their judgment is not to be trusted. They are inevitably biased; they see things crooked.

Still we cannot understand why Mr. Maxim so disingenuously attempts to conceal his interest in the manufacture of smokeless powder and other munitions. That does not seem quite sincere.

The armament business in the United States has not in the past been strong enough to control legislation as it has done in Europe. We have had no Krupps and no Krupp scandals. The word "aeroplane" does not smell here as it does in France.

But we are in danger. American firms are building

new plants simply and solely to make ammunition, and when this war is ended they will not want to see those plants idle. A recent letter from the National Association of Manufacturers to the National Security League is distressingly significant. It gives what the *New York Times* of July 24 calls "one of the strongest endorsements yet made by any board of directors." Naturally. And the National Association of Manufacturers is a political force not to be despised.

The armament business is rapidly becoming one of our great industries. It will want to continue such. It will have enormous resources with which to control legislation and influence public opinion through the newspapers. New plants are being built expressly to manufacture munitions for the Allies. When peace comes, these plants will be put out of business—*unless public opinion in America can be educated into giving them new jobs.*

When war orders for munitions, for textiles, for metals, for grain cease, industry will feel the real depression which the present hectic activity has only postponed. It will be a period of inactivity and discontent—in particular of vast unemployment which could be alleviated by big orders for ammunition.

The armament manufacturers to the best of their ability will use this situation to "educate" public opinion and to keep their business alive and flourishing. They will be able to make a very plausible case.

We approach a dangerous crisis. The armament business creates Mr. Maxim's type of explosive patriotism. The bigger the business, the more explosive the patriotism. The American people must beware.

SHOULD THERE BE MILITARY TRAINING IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

By LOUIS P. LOCHNER

NOT long ago, in making an inspection tour of the numerous camps of interned British, French, German, and Belgian soldiers that dot the map of little Holland, I chanced to dine with an English officer about whose daring feats as aviator I had read in American newspapers last November. We were discussing political ideals and institutions as affected by the world war, and my British friend was vociferous in proclaiming how the Allies would crush Prussian militarism. "The world will never be a safe place to live in," he said, "until we have beaten the Germans to their knees. There is not a Britisher worthy of the name but will shed his last drop of blood for the liberation of Europe from Kaiserism."

This was familiar language to me. I had heard it over in France at the outbreak of the war a year ago, when even the anti-militarist Socialists of the Grande Republique vied with the most conservative of Bourbons in denouncing German imperialism as the greatest foe of peace, and in their official organs admonished the "comrades" to make every sacrifice, even to the abandonment of their peace principles, to secure its dethronement.

I had heard it again and again in this country, nota-

bly in the language of men like Charles M. Schwab, whose company is being so visibly blessed for assisting in overthrowing German militarism that Bethlehem steel shares stand at 300 and are soaring higher daily!

I was, then, not surprised at my English friend's lofty tone. But I was not quite prepared for what followed. I happened to venture the opinion that I was not at all sure but that the Allies, in the process of wiping out German militarism, were prone to lose sight of their own democratic ideals. He turned to me sharply, and with a bang his fist came down as he said with warmth and fervor:

"Yes, thank God, this war will end democracy in England. Socialism, trades unionism, syndicalism, and all idle prattle about liberty and democracy will be a thing of the past when once we get conscription. The State has been altogether too lenient with all these cranks and faddists. But there will not be a ghost of a show for them after the war."

My British friend was not so far from right when he made this prediction. Jane Addams, returning from an investigation of European conditions which it has fallen perhaps to no other person to make, tells us: